

Weymouth

Sept^r 19 - 1877.

Dear Mr. Garrison.

265-

I was about to send you my collection of some Fifty reviews of "H. M. Auld's," when Mrs. Linnmore to whom I lent it for her lecture tells me she needs it yet longer, as her first Lecture is to be given on the 15th of October. - So the best I can do is to give you a list of the most important of some of them with reference to page &c, - Supposing they are all to be seen in the reading rooms of the Boston Pub Library, or the Athenaeum.

There is a remarkable difference in the tone of the New York & the Boston Daily papers.

The Herald (N.Y.)

The Evening Post

The New Union (Buckee)

The Engineer (Bellows)

abound in just praise, free from malice or falsehood

The Boston Daily Adventure has yet
the old pro-slavery Leprosy in its walls.
The author of a disagreeable article
in it is the Rev George Ellis.

Of the more important periodicals in America I have only
the North American Review &
the Atlantic Monthly. They are
both incapable of appreciating
fully, the great character they
are dealing with: — and James
Freeman Clarke, in the N. A. shows
much ignorance of his own times
and an itching to twist & misrep-
resent whatever shows him how greatly
he was wanting to them.

Clarke accuses H. M. of publicly
betraying the intimacy of private friend-
ship & personal confidence, in her statements
on Character. It is not so. Whenever
there were private & personal relations
says — "there I knew too intimately to
speak of them here." He says — she
violates her own rules in the introduction
by this "betrayal". No. To give an opinion
of a contemporary is no violation of
confidence, — nor is there any mean

listenings in refusing the publication of
her letters to some & allowing it to others,
according to her knowledge of the contents
of her letters & ^{the degree of} her confidence in the
character & ^{& judgment} of her correspondents.

It seems to me that what Clarke
would fain characterize as betrayal
of confidence is in fact the sin
on his eyes of a woman judging
men; & why not? Then her
way of knowing these things — "Through
her earlobe in the private intercourse
of society." Had not she their daily
deeds & life before her eyes also?
How does any body know any
things?

"It may be doubted", Clarke says
whether she was in any such danger of
being snubbed or murdered, as she & her
editors suppose. — "It is not probable
that any harm was as she thought
plotting against her life." How little
does this "Friend" know of his own
times! — or how great a hypocrite
is he! He gives in proof the fact that
he & Mr. Channing, ^{& that no objection}
was made in Danville — were
published & discussed there;

he prais her looks on Amence
But, as a man, cannot hear her
"tone of dogmatism & her ex-cathedra
judgments." - Now I think, on
examination it will be found that
she always sustains her statements.

But it was a fumble with her,
which I regret not to have register-
ed in my chapter of Conversation,
"always to make a sharp state-
ment." "Do not fumble &
explain away: it is an im-
mense loss of power. Know where
you are about, & give it."

He wonders how her family could
have hindered her from her career, &
made her mend her own clothes &
prevented her from having a maid
or a waiting woman. "It seems
difficult to see." I think it shows
the damage done from infancy to
a gentle affectionate nature. This
broke her down - & it was half
a life-time before she asserted
herself. & When she did, see
what came of it, in "the prospect

true Reverend."

Mr. Clarke says "it seemed necessary" for her Co-religionaries of the Unitarian faith, "to declare their dissent from her new views, & this dissent was expressed in an article in the "P. R." by her own brother, James Martineau. Mrs Chapman makes known, what has hitherto been only a matter of conjecture, that Mrs. Revue gave such serious offence to Mrs M. that from that time she refused to recognise her brother, or have any communication with him." Mr Clarke saw nothing amiss in this stigma publicly cast on the most distinguished Lady of the age, by her own brother, - of having been brought by meretricious influence on the part of an ignorant knave of a Charlatan, to be prostrated at his feet & reckless of Moral obligation, (!!!) It is but fair criticism - a legitimate expression of dissent from her views -

an expression of profound grief;
& "He, (Clarke) should have thought
he would have repined in having
a brother who would act in
this way." "It was evident he
had said nothing against her
deed at which she could take
offence, & that in speaking against
her views & her new philosophy,
he had committed the unpardon-
able sin.

If you take pains to read
this Review, — (North American
1877. (June, I think) I think you
will be shocked at Mr. Clarke.
I should consider such a hostile
notice for a case of defamation
sufficient for my Society: &
he ought never to be allowed
to enter a decent house

again. He is, in short,
no gentleman.

As an offset to this, I
quote the following from
"La Revue Protestantique et Littéraire"
— a French Review published in
Paris — the authors name
Léo Luesnel: —

"The change of names was a
great grief to the Unitarians. &
Mr James Martineau, though
himself forced to take the pen,
to declare ^{in public} before the face of his
coreligionaries, that he denied
(or rejected) [reniait] Harriet
Martineau for his sister."

You see how it looks
to the world.

Perhaps Mr Smalley, in
the Tribune, has been

as brutal as any one
in support of Abraham Hay-
ward of the ~~Adversary~~ ^{Ed 1832 April 17th} Quarterly.
ly. (I will not say Louam,
for I believe they a dream)
Think it is the world's quantity
— the quantity. He laboriously
defends, through a whole article
what the French under Magon-
tises as "a defamatory pamphlet
which for its eternal dishonour
shall exist, in the ~~Adversary~~ files of
the Quarterly. The quantity not living
& may remember that it inaugu-
~~rated~~ a system of pretended literary
criticism (attacking the author,
not analysing the work, & which
followed later by the Spectator
& others, has been for twenty
years a venal disgrace
to England."

As to the Nation's

Impure Knowledge of what
 Mr Channing did, & what he
was, at the narrow gap of
 what I can alone be cognizing
 in the rift through which I
 see in the life of Harriet
 Martineau, & consequently re-
 call my own testimony at
 the time as a Witness &
 Actor, — as to that, I would
 merely refer to the 1st edition
 of his work on Slavery.
~~the same~~

May 1877

The Atlantic Monthly
 article gives the ground
 as to Slavery &c at the
 time of W. M. F. West, &
 says it must be confessed
 we all stood on our heads
 at that time.

Hypocrite, in the woman's
journal" — is a man
betraying a woman.

Mrs Churchill, in the
succeeding number, is
much fairer & more
able, — but is ignorant
of the pro-slavery heats
& hates of the period —

The outrage & the
reign of terror.

The English Movement,
I have, except the Westmin-
ster, which is as a friend
writes to me, singularly un-
fair in quoting her "views"
as misrepresented by an
Enemy, (Dr Buckham or some-

thing like that — Beginning with
a B. at all events Buchanan
perhaps.) This is the more
unpardonable, as she was
a main pillar of that Bureau
under Dr Chapman, the co-
tor then & now. She made
him, so to speak: — & see how
he requites her!

They all wish to have
it understood that W. M. was
an industrious common place
woman (& they say so, as far
as their common sense allows them
to bow bent their own judgement.
They intimate that she was
not very famous, nor had
she much influence. They
are depreciating at every hand,
turns. They are ready like Bu-

learn on Zophim, Begun
with an attempt to curse,
changed by self respect to utter
a blessing. — or to thrust one
out reluctantly.

Three things which I have
said, wrong them excessively.

1. That she had a poet-heart.
2. That for the Honour of
England she should have been
buried in Westminster Abbey
3. That she was like Joan of
Arc — "Holy amid the knighthood of the
(which was the decentest way I could ^{think} of
meeting her brother's ^{fallen} ^{disgraceful} ^{honour}
one cannot ^{fully} meet the "dignity" ^{of her}
without injuring the substance of the ^{proof} ^{post} ^{will}
would fair blacken.)
4. That (quoting Pindar.) Great
& holy heroes shall be the ^{mark}
fruit of her life in all ^{the} ^{future} ^{time}.

One mistake I have made, as to an Englishman, Mr. Thom. Mrs Reed of London told H. M. that J. M. Co-Editors had said to her, (evidently that she might absolve them of complicity, to H. M.) That they knew nothing about the "entire": They were aghast when they saw it in print." I so stated it in a note. ^{I say he appears warmly.} Mr Thom denies ^{it} (in the Spectator.) I have cancelled that note in the next edition & substituted the following: "Mr. Thom denies this: & ^{thus} makes himself out & part in this "evil office!"

Also with regard to Shaw. I have said he was the "1st Am" (1st of the 1st black regiment-" I have corrected this, giving the credit to ~~W. Garrison~~ as due.

I fear I have wearied
you — it would have
been less honorable to you
to call for the reasons at
the Librarians.

I will try to find
time to give a list of
them. When Mrs. Lamer-
More has completed her lecture
I will, if you should then
wish, send them to you.

She is enthusiastic about her
subject. She wishes much to
see you, & to hear about
the "Knoll," & the Tomb

Most kindly, but most
truly your friend & ally,

A. W. Chapman.

The article in the Nation -
 (it repeated one from Samuel
 Lunnay, after he had received
 an intimation that one from
 him would be acceptable) is
 queer. (See the No of April 19th 1881.)

The writer knows too little to
 speak with much ability. For ex-
 ample, - he does not know
 that Margaret Fuller was cruelly
 condemnatory of H. M. (for whom
 she had professed a warm pre-
 viously.) after the publication
 of her Sentiments & of her
 book. That Margaret years
 after committed the same
 offence, & gone to a foreign
 country, realized things she
 had never appreciated in her
 own, does not signify at this
 point, any more than Dr
 Channing's draughty reason

Years after, to the abolitionists
as the rocky ground of
Mormon he at last took
crumbled from under
him. The Venturers of both
England & America have
him to defend as their best
excuse for short comings.

The Evening Post says
— "See me to expose the
English Reviewers actuated
by patriotic feeling in their
course about the American
"Memorials?" — (or to that
effect.)

There is one Eng.
paper — The London Observer,

Which says, However, that
Miss Martineau has shown
her usual good sense & good
judgment in her choice of
a biographer. And Lord
Moughton, who knew her
so well, writes to me —
"Your part is admirably
done." As he is himself a
biographer & aware of the diffi-
culties, he is, perhaps surprised
with a smaller measure of
success than her rivals exact,
who knew but little of her ex-
cept that she outshone them.

A.M.C.

